

DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to the telephone conversation discussed in the attached interview summary.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-8 are pending of which claims 1 and 4 are in independent form.

Claims 4-6 and 8 are currently rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 1-8 are currently rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 6/10/09 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Specification

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the phrase "such a" on line 2 is misspelled. Also the term "Fig. 1" following the abstract should be removed. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 4-6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Regarding claim 4, it is directed to a system however it does not recite any physical hardware elements. The "checker" as recited by claim 4 can be construed as consisting entirely of software. Since the claim covers an embodiment that is purely software, it is not a "system" and thus it is not patentable subject matter. The system recited is not a particular machine, nor does it perform any particular transformation. Claims 5-6 and 8 are rejected based on their dependency.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Butterworth et al. US 2004/0133656 A1 in view of Lewontin US 2005/0071419 A1.

Regarding claim 1, Butterworth discloses "redirecting a request for a web service in a data transmission network" (paragraph 45), "forwarding a request from the client to an old address of said web service" (paragraphs 13, 44), and "forwarding a second request from the client to the new address of said web service" (paragraph 58).

Butterworth does not explicitly disclose "sending back a message with a header, wherein the header ... contains a redirection to a new address" however this is taught by Lewontin as including a web service address in a header (paragraph 44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Butterworth to include the address passing feature of Lewontin for the purpose of redirecting web service requests. Lewontin suggests that by doing so web services can be provided from mobile devices (paragraphs 9-11).

Regarding claim 2, Butterworth discloses "new address ... is logged by said host" as storing an address in the form of a WSDL file (paragraphs 13-14).

Regarding claim 3, the combination of Butterworth and Lewontin does not explicitly disclose "said redirection is a SOAP header tag", however Butterworth does disclose using SOAP (Fig. 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention use a header tag for redirection. The SOAP specification provides header blocks. Redirecting requests is disclosed by the references. Thus naming a header tag redirect would have been obvious since that is the purpose of the

message. This is similar to relaying a SOAP message, when doing so the SOAP specification provides for a header block that is aptly named relay.

Regarding claims 4-6, they are system claims that correspond to the method of claims 1-3 and thus are rejected for similar reasons.

Regarding claim 7, Butterworth discloses “HTTP” (paragraph 11).

Regarding claim 8, it corresponds to claim 7, thus it is rejected for similar reasons.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Mountain et al. US 2004/0128622 A1 discloses publishing the new address of a web service so that it can be accessed.

Knauerhase et al. US 2005/0021663 A1 discloses redirecting web service requests.

Perham et al. US 2005/0050228 A1 discloses using information in the SOAP header to execute a web service.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JASON RECEK whose telephone number is (571)270-1975. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jason Recek/
Examiner, Art Unit 2442
(571) 270-1975

/Andrew Caldwell/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2442